

COPY

FILED

A CERTIFIED TRUE COPY

ATTEST

By April Layne on Apr 08, 2008

FOR THE UNITED STATES
JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL
on
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

APR 30 2008

UNITED STATES
JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION
CLERK: JAMES W. WIEKING
DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Apr 08, 2008

FILED
CLERK'S OFFICE

IN RE: VYTORIN/ZETIA MARKETING, SALES
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION

MDL No. 1938

TRANSFER ORDER

Before the entire Panel¹: Plaintiffs in eleven actions have submitted five motions,¹ pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, for centralization of a total of 33 actions. No responding party opposes centralization, but there is disagreement over the selection of a transferee forum. Moving and responding plaintiffs variously support centralization in the following districts: the Northern District of California, the District of Colorado, the Middle District of Florida, the Eastern District of Louisiana, the District of Minnesota, the Southern District of Mississippi, the Eastern or Western District of Missouri, the District of New Jersey, the Southern District of New York, or the Northern District of Ohio. Responding defendants² support centralization in the District of New Jersey.

This litigation currently consists of 33 actions listed on Schedule A and pending in seventeen districts as follows: twelve actions in the District of New Jersey, three actions in the Northern District of California, two actions each in the District of Kansas, the Northern District of Mississippi, the Southern District of New York, and the Northern District of Ohio, and one action each in the Eastern District of California, the District of Colorado, the Middle District of Florida, the Southern District of Florida, the Eastern District of Louisiana, the District of Minnesota, the Eastern District of New York, the Southern District of Ohio, the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and the District of Puerto Rico.³

^{*} Judges Heyburn, Motz and Scirica did not participate in the disposition of this matter.

¹ Although additional submissions styled as "motions" were submitted to the Panel, they were docketed as responses in accordance with Panel Rule 7.2(h). See Rule 7.2(h), R.P.J.P.M.L., 199 F.R.D. 425, 434 (2001).

² Merck/Schering-Plough Pharmaceuticals; Merck & Co., Inc. (Merck); Schering-Plough Corp. (Schering-Plough); Schering Corp.; Schering-Plough Biopharma; Schering-Plough Healthcare Products, Inc.; Schering-Plough Healthcare Products Sales Corp.; Merck Sharp & Dohme (Italia) S.P.A.; MSP Singapore Co., LLC; and MSP Technology Singapore PTE, Ltd.

³ In addition to the 33 actions now before the Panel, the parties have notified the Panel of 67 related actions pending in various districts across the country. These actions and any other related actions

On the basis of the papers filed and hearing session held, we find that these 33 actions involve common questions of fact, and that centralization under Section 1407 in the District of New Jersey will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of this litigation. All actions share factual questions concerning allegations relating to the use and/or marketing of the drugs Vytorin and/or Zetia. Centralization under Section 1407 will eliminate duplicative discovery; prevent inconsistent pretrial rulings, including those with respect to certification of class actions; and conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel and the judiciary.

We are persuaded that the District of New Jersey is an appropriate transferee forum for this litigation. Because Merck and Schering-Plough have their corporate headquarters within the District of New Jersey, relevant discovery may be found there. In addition, transfer to this district enjoys the support of defendants and several plaintiffs.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, the actions listed on Schedule A and pending outside the District of New Jersey are transferred to the District of New Jersey and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Dennis M. Cavanaugh for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings with the actions pending there and listed on Schedule A.

PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

~~Directly certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original on file in my office~~

ATTEST:

WILLIAM T. WALSH, Clerk
United States District Court
District of New Jersey

by **JOHN ICKLAN**
Deputy Clerk



D. Lowell Jensen
Acting Chairman

John G. Heyburn II, Chairman
Robert L. Miller, Jr.
David R. Hansen

J. Frederick Motz
Kathryn H. Vratil
Anthony J. Scirica

will be treated as potential tag-along actions. See Rules 7.4 and 7.5, R.P.J.P.M.L., 199 F.R.D. 425, 435-36 (2001).

**IN RE: VYTORIN/ZETIA MARKETING, SALES
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION**

MDL No. 1938

SCHEDULE A

Eastern District of California

George Artenstein v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-152

Northern District of California

Richard Haskin v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:08-376

ASEA/AFSCME Local 52 Health Benefits Trust, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al.,
C.A. No. 3:08-531

Helen Aronis v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:08-352

District of Colorado

Ronna Dee Kitsmiller, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-120

Middle District of Florida

Marion J. Greene v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:08-69

Southern District of Florida

Sam A. Ciotti v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 0:08-60077

District of Kansas

Charles Swanson, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-2040

John P. Dudley v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 6:08-1027

Eastern District of Louisiana

RoseAnn S. Flores v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-674

MDL No. 1938 Schedule A (Continued)

District of Minnesota

Jody Fischer v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 0:08-203

Northern District of Mississippi

Susan McCulley v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-16

Lisa Mims v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:08-10

District of New Jersey

Rita Polk v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-285

Jay Klitzner v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-316

Sandra Weiss v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-320

Lionel Galperin v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-349

Robert J. McGarry v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-350

Charles D. Maurer, et al. v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-393

Daniel A. Brown v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-395

Steven Knight v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-396

Ken W. Bever v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-430

David DeAngelis v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-431

Ciro Verdi, et al. v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-432

Marilyn Woodman v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-437

Eastern District of New York

Sigmond Tomaszewski v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-258

Southern District of New York

Joyce B. Rheingold, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-438

Stanley Levy, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-491

Northern District of Ohio

Theodore Sahley v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-153

Panayiotis Balaouras v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:08-198

MDL No. 1938 Schedule A (Continued)

Southern District of Ohio

Dennis Kean v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-61

Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Fred Singer v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:08-331

District of Puerto Rico

Alexis Alicea-Figueroa, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:08-1099